

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner issued a final rejection of Claims 21-26 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,178,529 (Short, et al.). Claim 25 was further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, and Claim 26 was further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, both first and second paragraphs. The Examiner also objected to the specification as not providing the proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter.

The Examiner indicated, in the Office Action, that Claim 27, which was dependent from Claim 24, would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of Claim 24 and to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. A review of the Office Action shows, however, that there were no rejections of either Claim 24 or Claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. 112.

To confirm the status of Claim 27, the undersigned had a telephone conference with Examiner Bruckart on July 7, 2008. Applicants' Attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of the interview. In this interview, the Examiner indicated that it does appear that there are no rejections of Claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. 112.

In an effort to expedite issuance of a patent for the present invention, Claim 27 is being rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of Claim 24. It is believed that this places Claim 27 in condition for allowance without further discussion, and the Examiner is thus asked to reconsider and to withdraw the objection to Claim 27 and to allow this claim.

All of the other pending Claims, which are Claims 21-16, and all of the withdrawn Claims 28-31 are being cancelled.

The cancellation of Claims 21-26 obviates the Examiner's objection to the specification. In particular, in the Office Action, the Examiner argued that the specification does not provide the appropriate support for the claims that are directed to a program storage device. Claim 26

was the only claim that was directed to a program storage device, and this Claim 26 is now being cancelled.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is also asked to reconsider and to withdraw the objection to the specification.

This Amendment does not raise any new issues, does not require any further searching by the Examiner, and, moreover, places this application in condition for allowance. It is, accordingly, believed that entry of this Amendment is appropriate, and such entry is respectfully requested.

Applicants have amended Claim 27 and cancelled Claims 21-26 from further consideration in this application. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the allowable subject matter noted by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

For the reasons advanced above, the Examiner is asked to reconsider and to withdraw the objection to the specification and the objection to Claim 27, and to allow Claim 27. The Examiner is also requested to allow the present application. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully Submitted,

John S. Sensny
John S. Sensny
Registration No.: 28,757

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza- Suite 300
Garden City, NY 11530
(516) 742-4343
JSS:eh